5:Cooper E-4 (no date) 1946 SG4 Araucanians SG4

Nonpolitical social grouping.—The modern *Mapuche-Huilliche* are divided into three loosely separated classes: the wealthy, the unattached-commoners, and the poorer people working as peons on estates. Earlier, too, there was a similar loose triple division into: wealthy and caciques, commoners, and "slaves" and captives.

Personal rank and prestige was derived chiefly from martial prowess and from wealth; generous hospitality, and eloquence in speech were other well-recognized avenues to status.

There were no secret or other societies, and no formal organization of age classes. There is no tangible evidence of moieties; the term llaficahuin, "la mitad de una regua," given by Luis de Valdivia (1887, s.v.) in his vocabulary, hardly constitutes such evidence, problematic though the meaning of the term be. There existed a type of "blood-brotherhood" (koncho), entered into by two men with a ceremonial giving and/or killing of a lamb or other animal (Félix José, 1916, 1:93, s.v. koncho; Moesbach, 1936, pp. 389–91). Other kinds of "brotherhood" were entered into between two men, two women, or a man and woman by drinking or eating together or by exchanging presents, and between two families or tribes by the more solemn ritual killing of a lamb and eating it together and by offering prayers. (Housse, 1939, p. 208–10; cf. Guevara Silva, 1908, p. 66; Havestadt, 1883, 2:691; Smith, 1855, pp. 260–62.)

ECONOMIC LIFE

Ownership.—Our earliest specific, albeit meager, information on land tenure is from the second half of the 18th century (Molina, 1901, pp. 122, 149; Gómez de Vidaurre, 1889, 14:341); later writers have added a little but not much. (Smith, 1855, pp. 240–41; Ruíz Aldea, 1902, pp. 15, 30; Guevara Silva, 1904, pp. 38–39; Bullock, 1911, p. 3; Latcham, 1922 b, pp. 412–13; Moesbach, 1936, p. 192; McBride, 1936, pp. 308–09.) If we piece together the scanty and incomplete data available, the following outlines emerge, though none too clearly: Each family or close-kinship group claimed a given territory which had been passed on to it from its ancestors, this territory being held jointly or communally by the family or group. Land not under actual cultivation or lying temporarily fallow was communally held. Each individual—or family—had exclusive rights of use to the land claimed as fallow or under cultivation by him, and to its products, and could transmit such land to his heir or heirs. According to Smith (1855, p. 241), only the headman could dispose by sale or otherwise of clan land to Indians who were not members of the community, but all selling of land to Whites was a capital crime. Each wife in polygynous households received her own garden plot from the husband (Ruíz Aldea, 1902, p. 30; cf. Moesbach, 1936, p. 192), and kept separately the products thereof; in addition, she owned her own chickens